REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 18, 2011, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 18, 2011. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-7, 18-21, 30-32 and 34-43 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 18-21, 30-32 and 34-43 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1-7, 18-21, 30-32, 36-37 and 40-41 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 18-21, 30-32, and 34-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gupta et al.*, (US 6,956,593, hereinafter *Gupta*), in view of *Scanlon et al.*, (US 7,668,798, hereinafter *Scanlon*).

With this response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the interface is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and to allow a user composing a second query to replace, in the second query, the annotated portion with the suggested substitution. Independent claims 18 and 30 recite similar limitations. Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are not taught by the references, individually or collectively. In particular, *Gupta*, even in view of *Scanlon*, does not teach any interface that is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution. Further, the references, even when combined, do not teach any interface that allows a user composing a second query to replace the

annotated portion with the suggested substitution in the second query. In rejecting claim 5, regarding the limitation of the suggested substitution, the Office Action states:

> Gupta et al. as modified, teaches . . . the suggested substitution being selectable to replace the selected portion of the query (See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42) . . . .

Office Action, p. 5. *Gupta* is generally directed to annotating multimedia content, *see Gupta*, col. 1, lines 21-24. The following table provides an analysis of each passage cited from G*upta*.

Gupta, col. 2, lines 43-47; col. 12, lines 39-59; col. 15, lines 34-45; col. 16, lines 19-42	Does the cited passage teach the claimed limitation of "an interface that is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and that allows a user composing a second query to replace the annotated portion with the suggested substitution in the second query"?
The user interface can be associated with selected ones of these different annotation sets, so that any newly created annotations automatically belong to that set, or annotation queries automatically query that set, without requiring the user to specify the set.	No. This passage merely discloses configuring a user interface to associate newly created annotations with a predefined, default annotation set. No mention is made of any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion.
Selection of a connection button 260 causes ABE 151 of FIG. 3 to establish a connection with the annotation server identified by identifier 254. Selection of a query button 262 causes interface module 152 to open a "query" dialog box, from	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses user interface widgets for searching and creating annotations to multimedia content.

which a user can search for particular annotations. Selection of an add button 264 causes interface module 152 to open an "add new annotation" dialog box, from which a user can create a new annotation.	
Selection of a preferences button 268 causes interface 152 of FIG. 3 to open a "preferences" dialog box, from which a user can specify various UI preferences, such as an automatic server query refresh interval, or default query criteria values to be persisted between sessions.	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses user interface preferences.
Selection of a show annotations button 266 causes interface module 152 to open a "view annotations" dialog box, from which a user can select particular annotations for presentation.	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses a user interface widget for viewing annotations to multimedia content.
FIG. 7 shows an exemplary "add new annotation" dialog box 280 that allows a user to create a new annotation. Dialog box 280 can be presented, for example, in response to user selection of add button 264 of FIG. 6.	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses a user interface widget for creating annotations to multimedia content.
FIG. 11 shows another exemplary "add new annotation" dialog box 360. Dialog box 360 includes much of the same information and fields for an audio annotation as dialog box 280 of FIG. 7 and dialog box 340 of FIG. 9. However, the	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses a user interface widget for searching annotations to multimedia content.

information and fields are arranged differently in dialog box 360. FIG. 12 shows a "query annotations" dialog box 370 that results from a user selecting query button 262 of FIG. 6. Many of the options and fields presented to the user in dialog box 370 are similar to those presented in the "add new annotation" dialog box 280 of FIG. 7, however, those in dialog box 370 are used as search criteria rather than data for a new annotation.	
In the illustrated embodiment, the sets displayed as part of annotation set list 376 contain annotations which correspond to the target identifier in target display 372. However, in alternate embodiments the sets in list 376 need not necessarily contain annotations which correspond to the target identifier in target display 372. Interface module 152 allows a user to select different target streams during the querying process. Thus, a user may identify a first target stream and select one or more sets to query annotations from for the first target stream, and then identify a second target stream and select one or more sets to query annotations from for the second target stream.	No, nothing in this passage discloses any suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses search criteria that may be used for searching annotations to multimedia content.
Additional search criteria can also be input	No, nothing in this passage discloses any

by the user. As illustrated, fields 382 and 384 allow a particular creation date and time identifier to be input along with a temporal relation (e.g., "after" or "before"). Similarly, a summary keyword search field 386 allows particular words, phrases, characters, graphics, etc. that must appear in the summary (or subject, title, annotation content, etc.) to be input. A maximum number of annotations to retrieve in response to the query can also be selected in maximum field 388. Furthermore, the query can be limited to only annotations that correspond to the target identifier in target display 372 by selecting check box 389.	suggested substitution for an annotated query portion. Instead, this passage merely discloses other search criteria that may be used for searching annotations to multimedia content.

As shown in the above table, *Gupta* does not disclose any <u>interface that is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and that allows a user composing a second query to replace the annotated portion with the suggested substitution in the second query</u>, as recited in the claims. Further, *Scanlon* does not cure these deficiencies of *Gupta*. Therefore, *Gupta*, even in view of *Scanlon*, does not teach or suggest at least the underlined limitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Jon K. Stewart, Reg. #54945/

Jon K. Stewart
Registration No. 54,945
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants